



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,294	04/25/2001	Tsung-Shien Chang	0006/0A007	7088
7590	02/16/2005		EXAMINER DUONG, FRANK	
Ya-Chiao Chang 9 South Wickom Drive Westfield, NJ 07090			ART UNIT 2666	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/842,294

Applicant(s)

CHANG, TSUNG-SHIEN

Examiner

Frank Duong

Art Unit

2666

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 12-17 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 5-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2666

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is a response to communications dated 04/25/01. Claims 1-17 are pending in the application.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,804,256. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed invention of claim 5 of the instant application encompasses the claimed invention of claim 4 of the patent '256. Evidence can be found through claims comparison. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 4 of patent '256 teaches essentially the same steps as claim 1 of the current application. Even though claim 1 is broadened by omitting certain limitations ("transmitting data ... rejecting .. unavailable"

Art Unit: 2666

(recited in claim 1)), it has been held that the omission of an element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184(CCPA). Also note Ex parte Rainu, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd. App. 1969); omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be an obvious variation. The addition of limitation "ONU number instructing ... key" is silence in claim 4 of the patent '256. However, this limitation is deemed to be either inherent or obvious to those skilled in the art of Ethernet over Passive Optical Networks. It is inherent and obvious to include this limitation in the OLT frame in order for the ONU to know which one the OLT frame is intended for.

3. Claims 1-2 and 4 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 2 of copending Application No. 09/792,309. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed invention of claim 2 of the copending application '309 encompasses the claimed invention of claims 1-2 and 4 of the instant application. The addition of limitation "ONU number instructing ... key" is silence in claim 2 of the copending application '309. However, this limitation is deemed to be either inherent or obvious to those skilled in the art of Ethernet over Passive Optical Networks. It is inherent and obvious to include this limitation in the OLT frame in order for the ONU to know which one the OLT frame is intended for.

Art Unit: 2666

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 12-17 are allowed.
5. Claims 3 and 5-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
6. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art of record, considered individually or in combination, fails to fairly show or suggest the claimed invention of claimed invention of claims 12-17 in a manner set forth as claimed.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record, considered individually or in combination, fails to fairly or suggest the claimed invention of base claim 1 and further limit with novel and unobvious limitations of "an automatic bandwidth adjustment beginning (ABAB); and an automatic bandwidth adjustment terminating (ABAT)", structurally and functionally interconnected with other limitations in a manner as recited in claims 3 and 5-11.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lee et al (USP 6,636,527).

Monzawa et al (USP 6,848,053).

Angelopoulos et al, A TDMA Based Access Control Schemes for APON's, IEEE, pages 1095-1103, 1997.

Kramer et al, Ethernet PON (ePON): Design and Analysis of an Optical Access Network, University of California, Davis, pages 1-25, 2000.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frank Duong whose telephone number is (571) 272-3164. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on (571) 272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2666

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Frank Duong', with a stylized, cursive script.

Frank Duong
Examiner
Art Unit 2666

February 11, 2005